



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,456	03/27/2001	Jeffrey Weiss	4030-123	1818
22440	7590	12/16/2004	EXAMINER	
GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN PC 270 MADISON AVENUE 8TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 100160601			TRAN, TONGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,456

Applicant(s)

WEISS ET AL.

Examiner

Tongoc Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's application serial no.

09/818,456 filed on 3/27/2001. Claims 1-61 are pending

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/23/2001 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 15 and 51 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The “,” at the end of the claims appear to be typographical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-24, 25-38, 40-49 and 51-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,437,

Art Unit: 2134

hereinafter Hoke) in view of Giniger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,729, hereinafter Giniger).

In respect to claim 1, Hoke discloses a system for allowing common control of at least two virtual private network devices comprising:

at least two virtual private network devices each adapted to establish one or more encrypted data streams over an open network between a group of clients and a respective local area network (see Fig. 1, col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 57 and col. 7, lines 28-45); and

an authentication server and database that are accessed by said virtual private network devices; wherein said authentication server verifies client credentials for said local area network (see col. 8, lines 37-65). Hoke does not disclose thereby allowing maintenance of only a single authentication server and database for both of said virtual private network devices. However, Giniger discloses an authentication server centrally holds authentication data for the organization managing the VPN (see Giniger, col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Giniger's teaching of storing authentication information for accessing VPNs in a centralized location with Hoke's teaching of authenticating user access to LAN through VPN devices for the benefit of simplifying VPN setup and maintenance (Giniger, col. 6, lines 23-30).

In respect to claim 2, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 1 wherein said database stores network access information for said local area

Art Unit: 2134

network for use by said virtual private network devices (see Hoke, col. 8, lines 37-65).

In respect to claim 3, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes a group identification (see Hoke, col. 8, lines 37-50).

In respect to claim 4, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 3 wherein said database stores user identifications, passwords and customer identifications (see Hoke, col. 8, lines 37-50, this information is inherently required in order to identify who and what group the user belongs).

In respect to claim 5, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes address filters (see Fig. 3, item 340, col. 11, lines 5-19).

In respect to claim 6, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes device address filters (see Hoke, Fig. 3, item 340, col. 11, lines 5-19).

In respect to claim 7, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes compression types (see Hoke, Fig. 3, item 340, col. 11, lines 5-19).

In respect to claim 8, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes time access constraints (see Hoke, col. 12, lines 12-32).

Art Unit: 2134

In respect to claim 9, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said network access information includes encryption types (see Hoke, Fig. 3, item 340, col. 11, lines 5-19).

In respect to claim 10, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said database is a directory service (see Hoke, col. 8, lines 37-51).

In respect to claim 12, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 2 wherein said database is remote from said authentication server (see Giniger, col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 3).

In respect to claim 13, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 12 wherein said database is accessed over an open network (see Giniger, col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 3).

In respect to claim 14, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 12 wherein said database is accessed over a local area network (see Giniger, col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 3).

In respect to claims 15-24 and 26-28, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 1-10 and 12-14. Therefore, claims 15-24 and 26-28 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 29-38, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar to system claims 1-10. Therefore, claims 29-38 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 40-49, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar to system claims 15-24 and 26-28. Therefore, claims 40-49 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2134

In respect to claims 51-60, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar to system claims 1-10. Therefore, claims 51-60 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

5. Claims 11, 25, 39, 50 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,437) in view of Giniger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,729) and further in view of Woundy (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,103).

In respect to claim 11, Hoke and Giniger disclose the system of claim 10. Hoke and Giniger do not disclose wherein said directory service is accessible via LDAP. However, Woundy discloses using lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) to access directory information in a network (see Woundy, col. 4, lines 34-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement LDAP with the teaching of Hoke's accessing user directory information for controlling user accessing LAN with Woundy's teaching of using LDAP to access directory information in the network for the benefit of acting as a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) server database that provides tight integration of subscriber personal information with subscriber device information (Woundy, col. 2, lines 7-14).

In respect to claims 25, 39, 50 and 61, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claim 11. Therefore, claim 25, 39, 50 and 61 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Rekhter et al. Disclose a virtual private network employing tag-implemented egress-channel selection.

-Subramaniam et al. Disclose a secure intranet access.

-Schneider et al. Disclose a distributed administration of access to information.

-Shanumgam et al disclose a method for selective LDAP database synchronization.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A. Morse can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT


December 6, 2004